Application No. 10/072,892 Amendment dated August 23, 2006 Reply to Office Action of

Docket No.: 1163-0390P

Moreover, each claim should be separately considered as a whole as being allowable over the prior art of record. For example, the Examiner has provided the same reasons for allowance for independent claims 18-21. However claims 19 and 21 do not recite converting a coding distortion if the coding distortion exceeds a threshold value. Instead, claims 19 and 21 recite replacing a selected excitation mode with another excitation mode in response to a particular comparison result. Thus, each claim should be separately considered and should not, in any way, be limited by elements listed by the Examiner, but not present in the claims.

Thus, Applicants respectfully emphasize that each claim should be considered separately as a whole, taking into consideration the various interrelationships and interconnections between the various claim elements, and should be interpreted based upon it specific claim language and other appropriate parameters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 23, 2006

Respectively submitted

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant